

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-3 are currently pending. Claims 1 and 3 are independent.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2001/0043795 to Wood et al. (hereinafter, merely "Wood").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

"A content-exhibition control apparatus for exhibiting content in another apparatus, comprising:

generating means for generating degree-of-exposure control data used to control the degree of exposure of the content;

exhibition control means for controlling the exhibition of the content recorded in the another apparatus, according to the degree-of-exposure control data generated by the generating means;

obtaining means for obtaining the state data of the content sent from the another apparatus,

wherein the generating means generates the degree-of exposure control data according to the state data of the content, obtained by the obtaining means;

storing means for storing user information which includes user preferences with the state data of the content collected from a hard-disk recorder in a customer database; and

feedback means for feeding back said degree of exposure of the content and statistical data calculated from contents of the customer database." (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicant, Wood relates to a video data recorder for recording predefined format shows having integrated channel guides allowing a user to control recording and storage of television signals. The user may specify criteria for recording of shows from an input source where shows are selected based on the criteria and recorded for later playback. The shows to be recorded may have a predefined format which may be used to ease playback of recorded programming by allowing the user to locate and playback sections of programming.

Applicant submits that Wood fails to teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 1. Specifically, Applicant submits that there is no teaching or suggestion of a content-exhibition control apparatus for exhibiting content in another apparatus comprising feedback means for feeding back said degree of exposure of the content and statistical data calculated from contents of the customer database, as recited in claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Wood does not provide the disclosure of claim 1. On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner cites, paragraph 53, lines 6-14 of Wood, which state, "...a 'fuzzy' match may occur by the system making assumptions about the viewing habits of the user. For example, if the user has been consistently recording a particular television series (e.g., 'Tool Time' starring Tim Allan), the fuzzy logic may choose to record a movie starring Tim Allan. If the user typically chooses to record action movies by title, fuzzy logic may be employed to select an action movie for recording." Further, lines 4-6 of paragraph 53 of Wood, state, "[a] 'fuzzy' match may occur where the description of a show matches some but not all keywords or satisfies less than all of the criteria." Applicant respectfully disagrees that the cited disclosure of Wood provides the subject matter of claim 1.

Indeed, Applicant submits that a match occurs by the system making assumptions about the viewing habits of the user where a user typically chooses to record movies by title,

fuzzy logic may be employed to select a movie for recording as disclosed in Wood, is completely different and provides no suggestion of feeding back said degree of exposure of the content and statistical data calculated from contents of the customer database, as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is patentable.

For reasons similar to those described above with regard to independent claim 1, independent claim 3 is also believed to be patentable.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 3 are patentable.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claim discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800